UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,277	02/06/2008	Abram Evert Van Laar	3135-062115	4259
	7590 09/09/201 AW FIRM, P.C.	EXAMINER		
ONE GATEWA	AY CENTER	GOLIGHTLY, ERIC WAYNE		
PITTSBURGH,	ESNE BLVD, SUITE , PA 15222	1200	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/09/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@webblaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/586,277	VAN LAAR, ABRAM EVERT		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ERIC GOLIGHTLY	1714		

	ERIC GOLIGHTLY	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
 a) X The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed (s) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO' w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); ducing or simplifying				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 18-30. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 31-34.		il be entered and an e	explanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ls to provide a			
10. 🛮 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Michael Kornakov/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1714	/E. G./ Examiner, Art Unit 1714					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: THe proposed amendment merely cures an indefinitness issue of claim 24 and will be entered...

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejections of claims 24 and 25 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the applied reference DE 10327413 to Schulte (published 1/5/2005) does not qualify as prior art against the present invention, a 371 filing, since the PCT filing of the present invention claims priority to Dutch application 1025308, which has a filing date of 1/23/2004. Applicant submitted an English translation of the Dutch application on 8/12/2011.

Applicant's argument is not persuasive since the present claims include combinations of features which are not supported by the Dutch application. For example, independent claim 18, from which all other pending claims depend, includes the feature of a pressure-generating mechanism for bringing the cleaning agent under pressure such that the pressure of the cleaning agent sprayed on the surface for cleaning fouled with chewing gum lies substantially between 300 and 750 bar, and that the apparatus comprises a mechanism for heating the cleaning agent such that the temperature of the cleaning agent sprayed on the surface for cleaning fouled with chewing gum amounts to a minimum of 115 degrees Celsius, in combination with the other claimed structural features, which does not find support in the Dutch application.

It is further noted that Schulte was applied in the non-final Office action mailed 9/20/2010, but applicant did not seek to disqualify it as prior art until after the final Office action mailed 5/12/2011.